



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

proval of publicists. I fear that if we should pass it, the Congress would lose, as it would deserve to lose, the confidence of the governments of the world.

I take pleasure, however, in acknowledging the merits of the writer's paper. It shows research, the scholarly research for which he is distinguished. It offers a method of procedure. The principle of the boycott is to be in the form of supplementary customs' duties. These are to be applied to a limited extent at first; but when public opinion is sufficiently advanced they are to go beyond the mere experimental stage, and there will be a complete interdict. The boycott would be resorted to as a sanction if a nation should refuse to arbitrate a case or to accept a decision when rendered. It would take the place of the military or the police in enforcing the law.

But even if the boycott were desirable, we have not come to that stage in the development of nations when they will agree to permit themselves to be cited to appear before the Hague Court. When we can require a nation to come before that court, we shall have impliedly, if not expressly, a federation of the world—which is what we all hope will come in time, but which is still remote. Perhaps this federation will use compulsion just as a State may use its police force to assist its courts in carrying out its domestic laws. But the details of the world's future federal system are mere matters of speculation. All we know is that international public opinion, and the consequent fear of international isolation, is the sanction of international law today. We have no international sheriffs or policemen.

The resort to the boycott would be dangerous. It would be bad for the internal life of the State against which it was enforced and bad for the whole family of nations that tried to enforce it. The boycott, if applied alike to exports to and imports from a State, would resemble in effect, though not in method, the non-intercourse acts and the embargo which were tried in the United States during the Napoleonic wars. These together resulted in a derangement of commerce and a state of irritated feeling that nearly caused secession and civil war in the American Union.

The boycott would be a dangerous weapon to put into the hands of the nations in these days when great financial "interests" often control the commercial policies of the foreign offices. The "interests" in one country might, upon pretext that some rival country had refused to arbitrate a doubtful case or accept an unpalatable decision, call for all the States to enforce the boycott upon the commerce of the recalcitrant and so destroy its prosperity. This measure, if adopted, might in some unfortunate moment be used against any of our countries. If, therefore, you would approve something which, if carried into effect, might work injury to the commerce of Antwerp or Hamburg, of Liverpool or Glasgow, of New York or Boston, vote for the principle of this resolution.

Moreover, the measure would be dangerous because, in order to be complete and universal in its effect, it must everywhere be supported by public sentiment. To secure the necessary public sentiment, appeal would have to be made to the people of all nations, and that might mean an appeal not to their sense of respect for law simply, but to their prejudices and passions. Public

opinion once thoroughly inflamed might go far beyond the control of the authorities, and demand a still harsher measure than the interdict. In any case, vindictive feelings might be excited that might last for years and demoralize the family of nations.

The Congress might just as well draw up a resolution approving war as to propose the boycott. If we adopt the proposition, the last state of the case will be worse than the first.

But viewed in the light of history the measure is unnecessary. One of the preceding speakers (Dr. Clark) has intimated that when England was ordered by the Geneva tribunal to pay a large sum of money to America for the damage done by the Alabama and other cruisers, she did so without threat of the police, and that Russia, when found responsible for the damage occasioned by the firing of her fleet upon British seamen in the North Sea, paid promptly the money that was due from her. But we can go back not merely one decade to the North Sea incident, or forty years to the Alabama case, though these together, with the recent Hague decisions, all of which have been accepted without use of force, would be evidence enough that the boycott is unnecessary; but we can point to an unbroken record of accepted decisions for a hundred years, going back to the Jay treaty of 1794. The situation would be quite different if there had been a succession of cases of arbitration in which states had refused to abide by the decrees of arbitral courts. Then it might call for a sanction of force of some other kind than public opinion; but there is hardly a single instance in which an arbitration decree has been rejected, unless it has been followed by agreement for a new arbitration or by diplomatic adjustment.

The demand for the boycott is artificial and imaginary. I propose, therefore, that we gratefully acknowledge the excellence of the report which the distinguished writer has presented, but that we lay his recommendations upon the table.

The Peril of the Air.

By W. Evans Darby, LL. D., Secretary of the Peace Society, London.

(Concluded from November issue.)

THE REMEDY.

The remedy clearly is for the leading powers to come to some understanding between themselves which shall prevent what the Baroness von Suttner very aptly calls "the barbarization of the air." This was the opinion held by a distinguished number of persons in Great Britain, three hundred of whom, early in the present year, signed

A MEMORIAL AGAINST THE USE OF ARMED AIRSHIPS.

"We, the undersigned, protest against the use of aerial vessels in war. We appeal to all governments to foster by every means in their power an international understanding which shall preserve the world from what will add a new hideousness to the present hideousness of warfare.

"Without universal agreement, no single power can stay its hand [*i. e.*, can retard its own action]; every day

of ingenuity and every pound of money spent diminishes the chance of such agreement.

"The occasion is unique. The civilized world is now alive to the ghastliness and economic waste of war; the Hague Conference is an established fact. For the first time, in the face of a new development of the arts of fighting, nations possess both the conscience and the machinery necessary to check that development effectually.

"All civilization protests its desire for peace and goodwill; protests its wish to reduce the already grievous burden of armaments. Unless its protestations be those of a hopeless hypocrite, it cannot stand and watch the conquest of the air, that most glorious of men's mechanical achievements, callously turned to the usages of destruction; it cannot idly acquiesce in a new departure that must heavily increase this burden of armaments.

"There are many who believe that aerial warfare, by reason of its sheer horror, must prove a blessing in disguise, frightening men from war. To those we say: Civilization does not sanction the ravages of a new and arrestable form of disease, in order that men through horror may be the more eager to join hands in stamping out all forms of sickness. And further: You underestimate the fortitude and adaptability of human nature, which has long proved that it can endure all forms of terror.

"There are some who insist that the art of flying will never reach full development without the stimulus of war. To such we suggest that the story of mankind does not leave us without hope that where there is demand, even when only for the purposes of peaceful life, there will also be supply. If the art of flying be delayed a few years by the resolve of men to use that art for mutual help and not for mutual destruction, the world will be no loser.

"There are many who argue that because men fight on earth and water, they may just as well fight in the air. To these we answer: There has never yet been a moment when it was practically possible to ban the war machines of earth or water. There is a moment when it is practically possible to ban those of the air. That moment is now—before the use of these machines is proved; before great vested interests have formed.

"Governments are trustees not only of the present, but of the future of mankind. Fortune has placed this moment in the hands of the governments of today. We pray of them to use it wisely."

As this document is very valuable, owing to the weight of opinion it expresses and its temperate and timely expression, I have ventured to quote it in full. It expresses what seems to be for the moment the only practicable course.

It may be asked, Why not restrict the use of airships to peaceful purposes? But how is that to be done? It is what we want. By law, do you say? But who will make the laws? Who will administer and enforce them? At present the area of law affecting aviation is very limited indeed, and in the unmeasurable, trackless regions where the new warfare will be, it will be difficult to apply legislation. Water hardly furnishes a parallel for air. I read, "Already a privately called International Congress on Aviation, meeting in Paris, has drawn up a tentative code governing the use of aircraft, which it hopes later on will be made the basis of

international governmental action." But there is no international government, so that the hope is futile. "An act to provide for the protection of the public arising from the navigation of aircraft" was passed by the British Parliament on June 2, 1912; and doubtless there are legal aspects of the problem which are both local and universal, involving the right of owners of land to the control of their property for purposes of the flight and landing of flying machines, and also some measure of control over the use of the air above land, which its owner can enforce. But any legislation affecting these can only be of a local and restricted character.

The question of aerial warfare was indirectly considered at The Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907, being dependent on the question whether the discharge of projectiles from balloons should be permissible. At the First Hague Conference, strenuous efforts were made by Captain Crozier, of the United States, supported by the British delegates and others, to secure a permanent prohibition of the throwing of projectiles from balloons; but a five years' truce was all that could be obtained. This expired on September 5, 1905. The provision was as follows: "The contracting powers agree to prohibit, for a period of five years, the discharge of projectiles and explosives from balloons, or by other new methods of a similar nature."

The subject was again discussed at the Second Peace Conference at The Hague in 1907. "Aerostation," says Mr. H. B. Leech, "had made great progress in the interval, and the sentiment of humanity had shown a proportional diminution." The main question was whether the prohibition should be renewed. Forty-four States being represented, its renewal was carried by twenty-eight votes to eight, there being eight abstentions. The previous declaration was renewed "for a period extending to the close of the Third Peace Conference." This has been adopted by twenty-seven out of the forty-four States represented at the conference. Among the non-signatories are to be found all the great European powers (except Austria and Great Britain), six other European States, and Japan.

Thus, as the matter now stands, any aerial act of war which does not transgress the accepted rules of land and maritime warfare is permissible as between the non-signatory States, and also as between a signatory and a non-signatory power. Nothing, evidently, to improve this can be done before the next Hague Peace Conference, except, of course, between individual States. Meanwhile, the case is pressing, so as to prevent the precedent being established and the great vested interests being formed. One thing can be done, and to be of service it should be set about immediately: I mean the creation of opinion and sentiment, which shall result in action when the time comes. I propose the adoption of three courses:

1. The preparation of an open letter, containing a reasoned protest and appeal, addressed in the name of all pacifists represented here, to the governments of the civilized world. This should be carefully drawn up (*motivée*) so as to appeal to the conscience and common sense of all peoples.

2. A strong and organized effort to influence governments in prospect of the Third Hague Conference. That is the natural objective of any action that we may take. It will be the first conference since this remark-

able development toward the conquest of the air has necessitated definite action, and will offer the first opportunity for the powers to enter into a common consideration, and, at any rate, to regain their lost position, if no more. Believe me, too, it will be in a sense *the last*; for what is decided then, or even drifted into, will finally establish the precedent that will govern the future. I appeal to you, therefore, that this urgent preparation for the Third Hague Conference be at once commenced, and that when the time comes a suitable and strong communication be addressed to the conference itself.

3. But that is not enough. Governments are notoriously dependent on and influenced by public opinion, and diplomatic delegates are under the control and direction of the governments appointing them. The people are, theoretically, the rulers, and if they are not practically, it is because they do not know how to use their power, and are divided and misled. Of the power there can be no question. War is no longer "the game of kings." No war can take place, even among the foremost nations until the democracy are carried into it by the press, and it is the business of politicians to study the varying currents of popular thought and sentiment, which they invariably do. I propose, therefore, that a united and effective appeal be made to the democracies of the world, and to this end that pacifists themselves should take up the question and study it well, that they may rise to a sense of its importance and of the danger that is imminent. The peace societies throughout the world should be invited to put it foremost in their propaganda until the final appeal to the Third Hague Conference is made. A series of powerful brochures or pamphlets, similar to "Die Barbarisierung der Luft," by the Baroness von Suttner, should be prepared, translated into all important languages, and circulated in all lands. Wherever possible a Van Mission and a system of popular lecturing should be used. The Carnegie or the Ginn Foundations, or both, should enable us to do all that is necessary, and they would be amply repaid. It is a large scheme, and it may be necessary to form a small committee to carry it through.

But what is done should be done quickly, before the use of these aerial war machines is settled, and "before great vested interests have been formed."

Armed Peace—The Burden and Folly of Europe.

By Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D. D.

(From the Congregationalist and Christian World.)

A distinguished general once defined war as "hell," and no one has yet ventured to question the accuracy of the definition. If war is "hell," then armed peace may perhaps be fittingly defined as "purgatory." The nations just now in fullest possession of the blessings of armed peace are not suffering the tortures of the damned, but only the torments of the place popularly supposed to lie next door to hell. In America one hears of armed peace with the hearing of the ear; when one sees it face to face, he exclaims, "The half was never told!" A few years ago I looked at it a long time from Berlin. Recently I have been looking at it from London.

AS EXPENSIVE AS WAR.

An American dropped down into this European world is surprised to find that armed peace and war have so many points in common. First of all, they are not unlike in their expensiveness. Armies and navies cost a deal of money, whether they fight or play. Men engaged in mimic battles eat as much and wear as much and shoot as often as they do in genuine warfare. When tens of thousands of men spend their days in drilling, they must be fed and clothed by the sweat and toil of others. Armed peace puts a soldier on every worker's back, just as war does. It costs even more to keep soldiers at play today than it used to cost on the battlefield.

Armed peace, like war, is tremendously exciting. It keeps the nerves a-tingling. There is a constant movement of troops, a continual shifting of ships. Strategic positions are seized and abandoned. Now, death-dealing inventions are snapped up at fabulous prices, spies are ever at work obtaining invaluable secrets. New combinations of land and naval forces present ever-changing problems. Fresh dangers emerge every day. War clouds of varying degrees of blackness flit across the sky. Terrifying rumors fly hither and thither. Alarming crises come and go, sometimes at the rate of two and three a week. Every time a battle squadron is shifted, military and naval experts set to work to calculate the possible effect on the dual *entente*, and the dual alliance, and then on the triple *entente* and the triple alliance. This is a laborious and intricate process, and weeks are sometimes consumed before a definite conclusion can be attained.

Every time a new battleship is launched, all the battleships and cruisers and destroyers of every nation are recounted, their tonnage and speed are reappraised and their comparative efficiencies are retabulated and newly discussed. Every time a governmental official passes from one country to another, a thousand pens begin to speculate and frame predictions. War furnishes rare opportunities for the wiseacre and gossip, but the opportunities offered by armed peace are immeasurably superior.

A SOURCE OF UNHEALTHY EXCITEMENT.

In war enormous space is devoted by the press to military and naval characters and operations, and the space is scarcely less in armed peace. Every paper has today its military and naval correspondents, and never have war correspondents displayed greater industry or genius than one finds in the reporters of armed peace. The literary output of these writers, both in quantity and quality, is amazing. The problems presented by armed peace seem even more numerous and fascinating than those created by war. The simple recording of the happenings of the military and naval worlds is itself sufficient to occupy the time of an army of reporters. Columns are devoted, day by day, to military and naval appointments and promotions, other columns are sacred to military and naval social functions, still other columns are filled with reports of inspections and reviews, of maneuvers and cruisers, of target practice and bomb-dropping contests, of battleship launchings and new appeals for additional battalions and squadrons.

The rattle of swords is always in one's ears. The flash of scarlet and gold is always in one's eyes. The thought of invasion and conquest is always in one's